

17 February 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Draft National Policy on Telecommunications and  
Automated Systems Security

25X1

2. I explained to Mr. deGraffenreid that I had sent the attached memo and was meeting with him in advance of the Community-wide 17 February meeting because I did not want to surprise him at that larger meeting with Agency objections; I thought it would be to our mutual benefit to discuss such objections one-on-one in advance.

3. Mr. deGraffenreid noted that my memo raised two categories of objections. The first included specific problems that might be correctable with relatively minor changes. The second was a larger philosophical disagreement over whether or not communications security and computer security should be covered by one directive/policy/procedure or by two. I pointed out that our preference was two, and I so stated for the record; however, if it were elsewhere decided that it should be one document, we would not withhold our concurrence solely on the one document-two document issue. I thought I had put the matter to rest, but Mr. deGraffenreid returned to it several times during the meeting. He emphasized that he was under direction to consolidate the two disciplines into one document, but when I pressed him to learn who had so decided/decreed, his only response was "my leadership."

4. In discussing our specific objectives, Mr. deGraffenreid appeared to show considerable flexibility. According to him, many of the interpretations we were giving to the draft were not as he had intended them. He seemed more than willing to rewrite, or to accept our suggested rewrite, of a number of paragraphs in

25X1

WARNING NOTICE-INTELLIGENCE  
SOURCES OR METHODS INVOLVED

CONFIDENTIAL

the draft in order to satisfy Agency concerns. It was agreed that we would submit, within the next several weeks, specific wording for the NSDD.

5. Mr. deGraffenreid noted that the 17 February meeting was not intended to be a decision session, but rather a session to elicit reactions to the draft. He stated that the Agency response was the first written response he had received.

25X1 6. Following this meeting and without Mr. deGraffenreid, we met with Mr. [ ] of the IC Staff. [ ] emphasized in very strong terms that one document joining communications and computer security would be unenforceable and unmanageable at this time. While I did not disagree, I stated that my instructions are to avoid that issue and to concentrate on protecting the DCI's authorities. We agreed on a two-stage approach. I will continue to seek rectification of the specific problems that we see with the present draft. Separate from that, I will seek clarification on the Agency's position on one versus two documents, and then proceed accordingly on that matter.

25X1

25X1

|                            |  |             |
|----------------------------|--|-------------|
| <b>TRANS</b>               |  | <b>DATE</b> |
| <b>FAL SLIP</b>            |  | 2/14/84     |
| <b>TO:</b>                 |  |             |
| [Redacted]                 |  |             |
| [Redacted]                 |  |             |
| [Redacted]                 |  |             |
| Copy given to [Redacted]   |  |             |
| for [Redacted] on 2/22/84. |  |             |
| [Redacted]                 |  |             |
| FILE : OS Registry         |  |             |
| PD-24                      |  |             |
| OC-MHS M-011 84            |  |             |
| <b>FROM:</b>               |  |             |
| [Redacted]                 |  |             |
| <b>ROOM NO.</b>            |  |             |
| 2B07                       |  |             |

FORM NO. 241  
1 FEB 83

REPLACES FORM 36-8  
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)